

**High Speed Rail Aff**

High Speed Rail Aff.....	1
1AC—Economy.....	2
1AC—Economy.....	3
1AC—Economy.....	4
1AC—Economy.....	5
1AC—Plan .....	6
1AC—Solvency .....	7
1AC—Solvency .....	8
1AC—Solvency .....	9
Advantage—No HSR Now .....	10
Advantage—No HSR Now .....	11
Advantage—Lack of Jobs Hurts the Economy Now .....	12
Advantage—Slow Job Growth Kills the Economy.....	13
Advantage—Economy In Trouble Cuz of Jobs Now .....	14
Advantage—US Key to the World Economy.....	15
Advantage—Economy Impacts (Extinction).....	16
Advantage—Econ Decline Impacts (War).....	17
Advantage—Econ Decline Impacts (War).....	18
Solvency—HSR Solves Environment .....	19
Solvency—Federal Action Key.....	20
Solvency—Congressional Funding Key .....	21
Solvency—HSR Creates Jobs .....	22
Solvency—HSR Economically Benefits Industry .....	23
Solvency—HSR Key To Economy .....	24
Solvency—HSR Key to Economy (Productivity) .....	25
Solvency—Federal Spending Key to Jobs/Economy.....	26
Solvency—Jobs Key to Economic Recovery .....	27
AT: Long Time to Develop/No Right of Way Access.....	28
AT: Econ Advantage CPs .....	29
AT: No Place for HSR in the US .....	30
AT: Nuclear Power Bad.....	31
AT: HSR Racist .....	32
AT: Spending Kills the Economy .....	33
AT: Other Factors More Important Than Jobs .....	34
AT: Economy Resilient.....	35
AT: US Not Key to The World Economy .....	36
AT: Economy Hurts the Environment.....	37
AT: Economy Causes Poverty .....	38
AT: States .....	39
AT: States .....	40
AT: States .....	41
Politix—Controversial.....	42
Politix—Republicans Hate It.....	43
Politix—Republicans Hate It.....	44
Neg—HSR Incompatible With Status Quo Infrastructure.....	45
Neg—HSR Not Economically Viable.....	46
Neg—Spending Doesn't Create Jobs .....	47
Neg—US Not Solve the Global Economy .....	48
Neg—Economy Resilient .....	49
Neg—States Solve .....	50

## 1AC—Economy

Observation 1 is the Economy:

**High Speed Rail is Not Coming in the US Now—Republicans are Closing Down Federal Spending on High Speed Trains and Obama's Plans Were Poorly Designed in the First Place**

Slate.com, "Requiem for a Train, Dec. 7, 2011

([http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\\_speed\\_rail\\_is\\_dead\\_in\\_america\\_should\\_we\\_mourn\\_it\\_.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high_speed_rail_is_dead_in_america_should_we_mourn_it_.html))

Well, you can stop imagining it now. High-speed rail isn't happening in America. Not anytime soon. Probably not ever. The questions now are (1) what killed it, and (2) should we mourn its passing? There was a brief burst of enthusiasm around the future of high-speed rail in January 2010, when President Obama announced \$8 billion in federal stimulus spending to start building "America's first nationwide program of high-speed intercity passenger rail service." Since then, however, the project's chances of success have been heading in one direction: downhill. First, Tea Party conservatives in Florida and wealthy liberal suburbanites in the Bay Area began questioning their states' plans. Then, just as Joe Biden was calling for \$53 billion in high-speed-rail spending over the next six years, a crop of freshly elected Republican governors turned down billions in federal money for lines in Wisconsin, Ohio, and Florida. Finally, Republicans in Congress zeroed out the federal high-speed rail budget last month. (To understand why conservatives hate trains, see my colleague Dave Weigel's story from earlier this year.) Though Republicans' outright rejection of high-speed rail is short-sighted, so were many of the plans themselves. Rather than focus on the few corridors that need high-speed rail lines the most, the Obama administration doled out half a billion here and half a billion there, a strategy better-suited to currying political support than to addressing real infrastructure problems. Spread across 10 corridors, each between 100 and 600 miles long. Obama's rail system would have been, at best, a disjointed patchwork. The nation's most gridlocked corridor, along the East Coast between Washington, D.C. and Boston, was left out of the plans entirely. Worse, much of the money was allocated to projects that weren't high-speed rail at all.

## 1AC—Economy

**High Speed Rail Promotes Economic Development and Rapidly Creates Jobs Nationwide**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

**High-speed rail's ability to promote economic growth is grounded in its capacity to increase access to markets and exert positive effects on the spatial distribution of economic activity** (Redding and Sturm 2008). **Transportation networks increase market access, and economic development is more likely to occur in places with more and better transportation infrastructure. In theory, by improving access to urban markets, highspeed rail increases employment, wages, and productivity; encourages agglomeration; and boosts regional and local economies.** **Empirical evidence of high-speed rail's impact around the world tends to support the following theoretical arguments for high-speed rail's economic benefits. Higher wages and productivity:** The time savings and increased mobility offered by high-speed rail enables workers in the service sector and in informationexchange industries to move about the megaregion more freely and reduces the costs of face-to-face communication. This enhanced connectivity boosts worker productivity and business competitiveness, leading to higher wages (Greengauge 21 2010). **Deeper labor and employment markets: By connecting more communities to other population and job centers, highspeed rail expands the overall commuter shed of the megaregion. The deepened labor markets give employers access to larger pools of skilled workers, employees access to more employment options, and workers access to more and cheaper housing options outside of expensive city centers** (Stolarick, Swain, and Adleraim 2010). Expanded tourism and visitor spending: Just as airports bring visitors and their spending power into the local economy, **high-speed rail stations attract new tourists and business travelers who might not have made the trip otherwise**. A study by the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2010) concluded that building high-speed rail would increase visitor spending annually by roughly \$225 million in the Orlando region, \$360 million in metropolitan Los Angeles, \$50 million in the Chicago area, and \$100 million in Greater Albany, New York. **Direct job creation: High-speed rail creates thousands of construction-related jobs in design, engineering, planning, and construction, as well as jobs in ongoing maintenance and operations.** In Spain, the expansion of the high-speed AVE system from Malaga to Seville is predicted to create 30,000 construction jobs (Euro Weekly 2010). In China, over 100,000 construction workers were involved in building the high-speed rail line that connects Beijing and Shanghai (Bradsher 2010). **Sustained investment could foster the development of new manufacturing industries for rail cars and other equipment, and generate large amounts of related employment.** **Urban regeneration and station area development: High-speed rail can generate growth in real estate markets and anchor investment in commercial and residential developments around train stations,** especially when they are built in coordination with a broader set of public interventions and urban design strategies (see chapter 3). These interventions ensure that high-speed rail is integrated into the urban and regional fabric, which in turn ensures the highest level of ridership and economic activity. For example, the city of Lille, France, experienced greater than average growth and substantial office and hotel development after its high-speed rail station was built at the crossroads of lines linking London, Paris, and Brussels (Nuworsoo and Deakin 2009). Spatial agglomeration: **High-speed rail enhances agglomeration economies by creating greater proximity between business locations through shrinking time distances,** especially when the locations are within the rail-friendly 100 to 600 mile range. Agglomeration economies occur when firms benefit from locating close to other complementary firms and make use of the accessibility to varied activities and pools of skilled labor. High-speed rail has also been described as altering the economic geography of megaregions. **By effectively bringing economic agents closer together, high-speed rail can create new linkages among firms, suppliers, employees, and consumers that, over time, foster spatial concentration within regions** (Ahlfeldt and Feddersen 2010). **This interactive process creates net economic gains in addition to the other economic benefits described here.** A case study in Germany (box 1) exemplifies increased economic benefits associated with high-speed rail, but in other cases the results have fallen short of expectations. This mixed evidence underscores the importance of ensuring that transportation connections, station locations, urban development, and promotional strategies are in place to maximize the economic impact of this capital-intensive investment.

## 1AC—Economy

**Continued Slow Job Growth Will Doom the Economic Recovery—New Creation is Critical to Avoid the Double-Dip**

Globe and Mail, “Economic recovery continues to rattle along,” April 29th, 2012

([http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economic-recovery-continues-to-rattle-along/article2417321/?utm\\_medium=Feeds%3A%20RSS%2FAtom&utm\\_source=Home&utm\\_content=2417321](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economic-recovery-continues-to-rattle-along/article2417321/?utm_medium=Feeds%3A%20RSS%2FAtom&utm_source=Home&utm_content=2417321))

**The world's recovery from the worst downturn since the Depression remains a work in progress. A number of events late this week could refuel the guarded optimism of the past two months – or reverse it and spark fears that the rebound has hit another soft patch.**

**On Friday, the U.S. Labour Department publishes April employment data. The U.S. jobless rate continued to inch downward in March – to 8.2 per cent – but the 120,000 jobs created were the fewest in five months and a huge disappointment to Wall Street analysts.**

**A second month of underwhelming job gains would underscore why most Federal Reserve policy makers are reluctant to shift a stance that has them likely on hold through late 2014.**

**Already, there are tentative signs that U.S. employment did take another step back** in April. A couple of weeks ago, weekly claims for unemployment benefits hit the highest level since early January. (They receded in the most recent week measured, but not by much.) **Economists warn that if unemployment settles around its current level, consumer confidence could stall, reversing much of the momentum** in Canada's main export market.

## 1AC—Economy

**Economic Collapse Will Be Devastating—The Rise of Hostile Fascist Political Forces, Disaster, Isolationism and WMD Conflict Culminating in Extinction**

J.R. Nyquist, Geopolitical Columnist, "THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF A FINANCIAL CRASH," Financial Sense, February 4th, 2005 ([www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html](http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html))

Hayek acknowledged that political exigencies might take precedence over economic principles. As it happened, Röpke did not publish Hayek's article. According to Hayek, "the political danger of increasing unemployment was so great that [Röpke] would risk the danger of causing further [economic] misdirections by more inflation in the hope of postponing the crisis." Within three years of Hayek's note to Röpke, Germany's troubles led to the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor of Germany. The question may be asked: Why were two economists of the Austrian School – Hayek and Röpke – willing to stifle their criticism of credit expansion in the face of political revolution? As it happens, political wisdom is not the same as economic wisdom. In politics the correct solution to a problem may not be acceptable to the voters. After all, the public does not understand economic principles. They do not recognize that pain is necessary to market correction and a healthy economy. Instead, they are frequently ready to reject good economic policy in favor of anti-market demagogues (like Hitler). From the point of view of practical politics, therefore, it is better to adopt bad economic policies and steal the demagogue's thunder than allow a totalitarian party to win popular approval and destroy the republic. It is still remarkable, however, that Hayek and Röpke were willing to accept the necessity of credit expansion in the case of Weimar Germany. Their colleague, Ludwig von Mises, warned against credit expansion in the text of Human Action: "A lowering of the gross market rate of interest as brought about by credit expansion always has the effect of making some projects appear profitable which did not appear so before." In other words, credit expansion leads to bad investments and an inevitable market debacle. "If the credit expansion is not stopped in time," Mises explained, "the boom turns into [a] crack-up boom; the flight into real values begins, [and] the whole monetary system founders." Mises also stated: "The final outcome of the credit expansion is general impoverishment." Sadly, the voters in Germany during the 1930s and the voters in America today do not understand the harmfulness of credit expansion. Worse yet, the Federal Reserve does not fully appreciate – or does not admit – that America must pass through a period of economic pain in order to regain its economic health. If the Federal Reserve cannot speak frankly, or act correctly in this regard, what can we expect from leading politicians? The party most associated with the free market – the Republican Party – will doubtless take the blame for future economic consequences. Logically, the political left – now in firm control of the Democratic Party – will make significant gains. In a book titled Omnipotent Government, written during World War II, Ludwig von Mises noted that the Nazis initially triumphed because the "fundamental tenets of the Nazi ideology do not differ from the generally accepted social and economic ideologies." According to Mises, these "generally accepted" ideologies embrace the following six points: "(1) Capitalism is an unfair system of exploitation. It injures the immense majority for the benefit of a small minority.... (2) It is therefore the foremost duty of popular government to substitute government control of business for the management of capitalists and entrepreneurs. (3) Price ceilings and minimum wage rates ... are an adequate means for improving the lot of the consumers and permanently raising the standard of living.... (4) Easy money policy, i.e., credit expansion, is a useful method of lightening the burdens imposed by capital upon the masses and making a country more prosperous. It has nothing to do with the periodical recurrence of economic depression. Economic crises are an evil inherent in unhampered capitalism. (5) All those who ... assert that capitalism best serves the masses ... are ill-intentioned and narrow-minded apologists of the selfish class interests of the exploiters.... (6) The advantage derived from foreign trade lies exclusively in exporting. Imports are bad and should be prevented as much as possible." (See pp. 222-223.) at a time of economic crisis, the appeal of Nazi economic ideas must prove irresistible. It stands to reason, therefore, that a future financial crash will benefit political extremists whose ideas coincide with those listed above. Please note: there is no appreciable difference between the six dogmas listed above and the rhetoric of the Democrats in Congress. Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America's strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth's surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet's economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, "We drank the poison and now we must die."

**1AC—Plan**

**Plan: The United States Federal Government Should Fully Fund the Construction and Operation of Inter-City High Speed Passenger Rail Systems.**

## 1AC—Solvency

## Observation 2 is Solvency

**Empirically, Federal Authority is the Only Way HSR Can Gain Traction—Only Solid National Leadership Will Do the Trick**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011  
[https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf)

Each country that has developed high-speed rail has done so with strong national government leadership. Prior to President Barack Obama's recent embrace of high-speed rail, federal government support had been a missing ingredient in U.S. passenger rail development. However, significant federal investments in high-speed rail in 2009–2010 put the federal High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program on a solid initial footing. Whether that commitment can be sustained in a difficult fiscal environment will determine whether high-speed rail in the United States can become a reality. The federal commitment to high-speed rail began in 2008, when Congress passed the Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act (PRIIA), which authorized funding for Amtrak and state-led efforts to develop highspeed rail corridors between 2009 and 2013. In February 2009, just months after PRIIA was signed into law at the end of 2008, the act became the vehicle for appropriating \$8 billion for high-speed rail under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). An additional \$2.5 billion for high-speed rail was appropriated by Congress in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 budget (figure 8). These appropriations, totaling \$10.5 billion for high-speed and passenger rail, transformed the preservation-focused program established by PRIIA into a highly visible high-speed rail initiative that later became the centerpiece of the Obama administration's infrastructure agenda. However, this sudden infusion of funding also revealed PRIIA's limitations and the challenges of creating an ambitious highspeed and intercity passenger rail program virtually overnight. The subsequent Congressional appropriation for FY 2011 stripped the program of any funding in 2011 and rescinded \$400 million from the FY 2010 budget. This abrupt reversal underscores the program's vulnerability to shifting political winds as long as it has to rely on annual Congressional appropriations for its funding.

## 1AC—Solvency

**Now is a Key Time for HSR Development—Infrastructure Can Be Acquired and Developed With Rapid and Long Term Economic Benefits**

John Rosenthal, contributing editor for National Geographic Traveler, “Riding High-Speed Rail to a U.S. Recovery,” Bloomberg News, December 18th, 2011 (<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-12-19/riding-high-speed-rail-to-a-u-s-recovery-john-rosenthal.html>)

The weak economy only increases the urgency. Interest rates are at historic lows, real estate values remain depressed, private sector spending is stagnant, and unemployment is stuck around 9 percent. There could hardly be a better time to borrow billions of dollars to buy up land for train rights-of-way and to create high-paying jobs in engineering, manufacturing and construction.

When Florida’s Republican governor, Rick Scott, returned \$2.4 billion in federal rail funds last year, he also expunged about 17,000 construction jobs in one of the most depressed areas of his state. The Florida corridor, which could have linked Orlando to Tampa as early as 2014, was projected to return an operating profit of \$10 million in its first year alone.

Out of Depression

From the Appian Way to the Erie Canal, economic development has always followed transportation. Businesses small and large cluster around train depots, propelling real estate values and generating millions in new property taxes. The U.S. built its way out of the Depression by investing in massive projects such as the Empire State Building, the Hoover Dam and the Blue Ridge Parkway. High-speed rail is a time-proven way out of today’s economic morass.



1AC—Solvency
--------------

**High Speed Rail Boosts Economic Development and Aids Productivity**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

**Decades of international experience with high-speed rail suggests that it could create similar transportation, economic, environmental, and safety benefits in American cities and regions. While it requires high upfront investment, high-speed rail promotes economic growth by improving market access, boosting productivity of knowledge workers, expanding labor markets, and attracting visitor spending. When planned thoughtfully with complementary investments in the public realm, high-speed rail can promote urban regeneration and attract commercial development**, as shown in several European examples. High-speed rail has greater operating energy efficiency than competing modes and takes up less land than highways.

**Advantage—No HSR Now****Congress Has Stripped High Speed Rail Funding Now**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

The initial investment of \$10.1 billion in the U.S. High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program, after years of minimal federal investment, required that the federal government and participating states quickly scale up to the challenge of laying the groundwork for a foundational program and implementing it at the same time. Those states that had the staff capacity, expertise, and experience in rail planning, such as Illinois, North Carolina, and Washington, were successful in securing high-speed rail grants. However, carrying the momentum of this initial investment forward has proven to be a struggle in a difficult fiscal environment, and California is currently the only federally funded Core Express high-speed rail project moving forward. In 2011, Congress voted to strip funding from the program. The expiration of the legislation authorizing the high-speed rail program in 2013 may provide an opportunity to consider policy changes.

**Advantage—No HSR Now****Obama's Support for High Speed Rail Has Been Tanked By Tea-Party Anti-Spending Idiocy**

John Rosenthal, contributing editor for National Geographic Traveler, "Riding High-Speed Rail to a U.S. Recovery," Bloomberg News, December 18th, 2011 (<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-12-19/riding-high-speed-rail-to-a-u-s-recovery-john-rosenthal.html>)

Much as Dwight D. Eisenhower made the Interstate Highway System a hallmark of his administration, Obama pledged to make a national network of bullet trains the legacy of his. Governors from both parties applied for the initial round of \$8 billion in funds from the \$787 billion stimulus bill.

Because of its ingenious scope, neither the airlines nor the [auto industry](#) contested the plan. It targeted corridors among major cities that are too far apart to drive, but too close to make flying worth the time and hassle of trudging through airport security: Chicago, [Detroit](#), [St. Louis](#) and [Milwaukee](#), for example, or Atlanta, [Charlotte](#), Birmingham and [New Orleans](#). Although trains wouldn't compete with planes between [New York](#) and [Los Angeles](#) or, for that matter, Chicago, the plan would put high-speed rail within the reach of 80 percent of Americans.

At the time, there was little opposition. The first awards were announced in January 2010, and while there was predictable griping about which corridors got the most money, support remained high for the program overall.

**Tea Party Surge**

Then came the Tea Party uprising of 2010, ushering in a crowd of anti-spending legislators. They immediately set out to derail the program, which they conflated with the supposedly socialist agenda the president was pushing with his health-care overhaul. Newly elected Tea Party governors in Florida, [Wisconsin](#) and [Ohio](#) returned a total of \$3.6 billion in stimulus awards; Representative Paul Ryan of Wisconsin introduced an amendment to rescind \$2.3 billion in rail funding that hadn't yet been spent.

The protests were mostly grandstanding, and didn't end up denting the deficit by a dime. Ryan's bill stalled in the Senate, while the grants to Florida, Wisconsin and Ohio were redistributed to other states. Wisconsin's governor, Scott Walker, even applied for an award from a later round of federal funding to upgrade rail between [Chicago](#) and Milwaukee.

This opposition may have been good politics, but it's terrible policy for America. The arguments in favor of high-speed rail are just as compelling as they were in the early 1990s, when President [George H.W. Bush](#)'s administration first outlined the rail corridors.

**Advantage—Lack of Jobs Hurts the Economy Now****The Economy is Not Recovering Fast Enough—Lack of Jobs is Maintaining the Recession**

ABC News, "Is America's Economic Recovery Built To Last?" April 29th, 2012

(<http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/04/is-americas-economic-recovery-built-to-last/>)

A new report Friday showed that the country's GDP had grown by only 2.2 percent in the first quarter of the year, down from 3 percent in the last quarter, while the latest jobs report showed slower growth than expected in March, after several strong months.

ABC News' George Will questioned whether the economy was recovering at all, given the distance from pre-recession employment levels.

"The threshold question is not is the recovery built to last, but does it exist?" Will asked. "Fifty months have passed and we're not nearly back to the pre-recession employment level. This is the longest string of consecutive months of 8 percent or more unemployment since the Depression, 5.5 million fewer people are working today than were working before the recession."

**Advantage—Slow Job Growth Kills the Economy****Lack of New Jobs is Devastating the Forecast For Economic Growth**

Financial Times, "Economic outlook: Focus on US jobs data," April 30th, 2012 (<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/fa6fa818-905c-11e1-8adc-00144feab49a.html#axzz1tUKyk64W>)

Friday's non-farm payroll report from Washington is likely to exert an influence over sentiment for much of the week as markets continue to weigh the strength of the US recovery against the threat to global growth posed by the rekindled eurozone debt crisis.

Economists expect a net addition of 170,000 to the number of jobs in the US outside the agricultural sector, after [April's rise of 120,000](#) disappointed. Analysts said the steep declines in the number employed in the retail sector in March and April were unlikely to be repeated, although the rate of hiring in the manufacturing sector could ease.

The overall unemployment rate is expected to remain above 8 per cent, with the most optimistic predictions suggesting it could slip from 8.2 per cent to 8.1 per cent.

Both sets of jobs data will shape the Federal Reserve's thinking on the need for more stimulus, meaning a significantly downbeat number could lift market sentiment by making a third round of quantitative easing more likely.

One of the Fed board's more dovish members, Daniel Tarullo, will be making a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on Wednesday.

Traders will be alert for any signs of a more determined advocacy for more stimulus as they shape their own expectations on US monetary policy ahead of the non-farm payrolls report.

**Advantage—Economy In Trouble Cuz of Jobs Now****American Economy Will Remain in the Dumps in the Status Quo—Risks of Extended Shocks Remain As Long as Employment is Slow**

Op-Ed News, "US slowdown intensifies global economic crisis," April 29th, 2012

(<http://www.opednews.com/articles/US-slowdown-intensifies-gl-by-Patrick-Martin-120429-231.html>)

US economic growth slowed in the first quarter of 2012, with gross domestic product rising by only 2.2 percent, according to figures reported by the Department of Commerce Friday. The figure was well below the consensus forecast of 2.6 percent among corporate economists surveyed by Dow Jones Newswires.

The figure suggests that job creation in the United States will remain in the doldrums, and that the unemployment rate may rise above the current official level of 8.2 percent, after falling from 9.1 percent over the past six months.

It comes as the global capitalist economy continues to stagnate, with the major economies of Europe -- Germany, Britain, France, Italy and Spain -- all either entering a double-dip recession or on the brink of doing so. Japan is also in recession, and economic growth in China and India has slowed significantly, well below the 10 percent rates of recent years.

World capitalism remains poised on a knife-edge, threatening a renewed global financial crisis that could be triggered by potential shocks, whether debt defaults by Greece and a half dozen other countries in the eurozone, a financial implosion like the Lehman Brothers collapse in 2008, or the outbreak of war in the oil-rich Middle East or some other international flashpoint.

**Advantage—US Key to the World Economy****US Economic Failure is a Substantial Challenge to the World Economy**

World Economic Forum, "The Changing Economic Landscape," Annual Meeting Report for 2006, January, 2006 (<http://www.weforum.org/pdf/summitreports/am2006/changing.htm>)

Given US influence on the global economy, its current account deficit of 5.7% of GDP in 2004 or US\$ 666 billion, continues to concern policy-makers in Washington DC and abroad. China's economy is still too small to counter a possible US slowdown, and Europe and Japan, while perhaps improving, are currently too slow growing to drive the global economy forward. Moreover, the major economies are struggling to keep fiscal promises as their pension and healthcare bills grow. Inequities in trade and increased competition for natural resources mean risk is rising – especially to the environment. While the world economy has proven resilient enough to absorb a sustained US\$ 60 a barrel for oil, participants were quick to agree, if prices rise further and stay high, the effects will hurt. The global economy is beset with inefficiencies and imbalances that threaten to derail growth and halt efforts to bring prosperity to the world's poorest corners. US deficits and yawning Asian surpluses, inequities in trade and the increasingly heated race for natural resources pose risks.

**Advantage—Economy Impacts (Extinction)****Desperate Economic Situations are the Possibility for WMD Exchange and Civilization Ending War**

T.E. Bearden, Fellow, Alpha Foundation's Institute for Advanced Study & Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists, "The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly," ADAS POSITION PAPER: SOLUTION TO THE ENERGY CRISIS, June 12th, 2000

([www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc](http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc)).

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {2} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.



**Advantage—Econ Decline Impacts (War)****Empirically Economic Decline is the Cause of War**

Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, , "Only Makes You Stronger," The New Republic, February 4th, 2009 (<http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>)

History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

**Advantage—Econ Decline Impacts (War)****Continued Economic Crisis Causes Social Unrest, Conflict and War**

Dominique Strauss-Kahn, Managing Director of the IMF, "Economic Stability, Economic Cooperation, and Peace—the Role of the IMF," October 23rd, 2009 (<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/2009/102309.htm>)

Let me stress that the crisis is by no means over, and many risks remain. Economic activity is still dependent on policy support, and a premature withdrawal of this support could kill the recovery. And even as growth recovers, it will take some time for jobs to follow suit. This economic instability will continue to threaten social stability. The stakes are particularly high in the low-income countries. Our colleagues at the United Nations and World Bank think that up to 90 million people might be pushed into extreme poverty as a result of this crisis. In many areas of the world, what is at stake is not only higher unemployment or lower purchasing power, but life and death itself. Economic marginalization and destitution could lead to social unrest, political instability, a breakdown of democracy, or war. In a sense, our collective efforts to fight the crisis cannot be separated from our efforts guard social stability and to secure peace. This is particularly important in low-income countries. War might justifiably be called "development in reverse". War leads to death, disability, disease, and displacement of population. War increases poverty. War reduces growth potential by destroying infrastructure as well as financial and human capital. War diverts resources toward violence, rent-seeking, and corruption. War weakens institutions. War in one country harms neighboring countries, including through an influx of refugees. Most wars since the 1970s have been wars within states. It is hard to estimate the true cost of a civil war. Recent research suggests that one year of conflict can knock 2-2½ percentage points off a country's growth rate. And since the average civil war lasts 7 years, that means an economy that is 15 percent smaller than it would have been with peace. Of course, no cost can be put on the loss of life or the great human suffering that always accompanies war. The causality also runs the other way. Just as wars devastate the economy, a weak economy makes a country more prone to war. The evidence is quite clear on this point—low income or slow economic growth increases the risk of a country falling into civil conflict. Poverty and economic stagnation lead people to become marginalized, without a stake in the productive economy. With little hope of employment or a decent standard of living, they might turn instead to violent activities. Dependence on natural resources is also a risk factor—competition for control over these resources can trigger conflict and income from natural resources can finance war. And so we can see a vicious circle—war makes economic conditions and prospects worse, and weakens institutions, and this in turn increases the likelihood of war. Once a war has started, it's hard to stop. And even if it stops, it's easy to slip back into conflict. During the first decade after a war, there is a 50 percent chance of returning to violence, partly because of weakened institutions.

## Solvency—HSR Solves Environment

### HSR Provides Incredible Environmental Benefits—They Remove Alternative Programs Which Would Devastate Ecosystems

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

High-speed rail has the potential to provide greater environmental benefits and energy efficiencies than other modes of long distance travel. However, several conditions must be met to obtain these benefits. **Energy efficiency and ridership:** High-speed rail offers greater operating efficiency on a per passenger mile basis than competing modes, such as single-occupancy automobiles or airplanes that require significant amounts of fuel to get off the ground. For example, *Shinkansen* trains are estimated to use one-quarter the energy of airplanes and one-sixth that of private automobiles per passenger mile (JR Central 2011a). To achieve environmental benefits, highspeed trains must maximize load factors to realize the greatest efficiencies. As highspeed rail ridership increases, so does its relative energy efficiency, whereas a high-speed train carrying no passengers ceases to be efficient in any sense. In regions where the number of total trips is not growing, high-speed rail can bring about a net reduction of energy use through mode shift by capturing passengers from automobile or airplane trips. In regions like California where population and trips are projected to keep growing, highspeed rail can help reduce the energy and climate impacts on a per passenger basis through a combination of mode shift and attracting new passengers to high-speed rail. **Energy mix:** High-speed rail is the only available mode of long-distance travel that currently is not dependent on motor fuels. High-speed rail is powered by electricity, which is not without environmental problems depending on its source (see table 2). If it is powered by electricity generated from fossil fuels, such as coal or natural gas that discharge harmful greenhouse gas emissions, then its environmental benefits are limited. However, electricity is generally considered an improvement over petroleum-generated power and provides a crucial advantage as the United States aims to reduce its dependence on foreign oil. Amtrak's Northeast Corridor and parts of the Keystone Corridor (connecting Harrisburg, Pennsylvania to Philadelphia) are electrified. Most other conventional passenger trains in America operate on freight rail lines and are powered by diesel fuel.

**Solvency—Federal Action Key****Sustained Federal Commitment is Key to the Success of Passenger HSR**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

The current federal policy framework for high-speed rail was shaped in response to both the history of unreliable and minimal federal contributions for passenger rail and the efforts of individual states acting on their own initiative and with their own funding to improve rail corridors. While PRIIA is an improvement over the previous lack of a U.S. passenger rail policy, it is not well-suited to a more ambitious, sustained federal commitment to building dedicated, multistate high-speed rail corridors. Unlike the U.S. highway and transit programs, which rely on dedicated revenue streams from the federal motor fuels tax, passenger rail has no dedicated source of revenue and thus relies on Congress for general fund appropriations. Prior to the passage of PRIIA, most passenger rail appropriations were made directly to Amtrak each year, but with no multiyear authorization since 2002. Numerous Amtrak officials have testified to Congress over the years that the uncertainty of these annual, often politicized, appropriations makes planning and operating the railroad difficult.

**Solvency—Congressional Funding Key****Congressional Funding Decisions are the Only Way to Ensure the Successful High Speed Rail Programs**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

The challenge of securing revenue for rail investments is closely linked to the challenge of funding the nation's entire surface transportation program. While in the past revenues from the federal motor fuel taxes were sufficient to cover the nation's highway and transit priorities, the 18.4 cents per gallon gasoline tax has been fixed since 1993, while the dollar has lost one-third of its purchasing power in that time (RAND Corporation 2011). New sources of sustainable revenue are needed to support not only high-speed and conventional passenger rail but also all of the nation's surface transportation obligations, including highways and transit. In recent years, Congress has addressed the funding shortfall with short-term fixes by transferring general fund revenues to the highway trust fund. However, the need to find a long-term solution presents the opportunity to address existing surface transportation needs and high-speed and passenger rail all at once. At some point in the near future, Congress must address the shortfall in national transportation funding. At that time legislators could also dedicate revenues for high-speed and passenger rail as part of the surface transportation program, generated by a variety of small increases or reallocations of current transportation-related fees to provide at least \$5 billion in annual funds. Several proposals are currently being considered.

**Solvency—HSR Creates Jobs****High Speed Rail Will Create Tons of Good Paying, Economically Productive American Jobs**

Philadelphia Inquirer, "Foreign firms see profits in U.S. high-speed rail," April 11th, 2012

([http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20100810\\_Foreign\\_firms\\_see\\_profits\\_in\\_U\\_S\\_high-speed\\_rail.html?viewAll=y#ixzz1tOlvIZDW](http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20100810_Foreign_firms_see_profits_in_U_S_high-speed_rail.html?viewAll=y#ixzz1tOlvIZDW))

The French, Spanish, Germans, Japanese, or Chinese will provide the expertise that is a lost art in the United States. The countries that once relied on American ingenuity to build their trains now vie with one another to sell high-speed rail systems to the United States.

But, since U.S. law requires that the trains be built in the United States by American workers, foreign-owned train factories could mean thousands of jobs and billions of dollars for U.S. locales.

And the construction of bridges, tunnels, and stations around the country could mean work for tens of thousands more Americans.

Vice President Biden cited those jobs when he and President Obama announced \$8 billion in federal grants for high-speed rail this year in Tampa, Fla.

"How can we, the leading nation in the world, be in a position where China, Spain, France - and name all the other countries - have rail systems that are far superior to ours?"

After noting how high-speed trains would reduce congestion, cut pollution, and increase productivity, Biden said: "Most important, we're creating jobs - good jobs. Construction jobs. Manufacturing jobs. And we're going to be creating them right now. We're going to spur economic development in the future and we're making our communities more livable all in the process."

A recent report by Boston-based Economic Development Research Group researchers estimated the number of jobs that U.S. rail spending would create: 24,000 construction and manufacturing jobs per \$1 billion in capital investment, and 41,000 operation and maintenance jobs per \$1 billion in operating investment.

**Solvency—HSR Economically Benefits Industry****HSR Infrastructure Will Benefit Industry, Create Investments and Demand**

U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:Public, Private or Both?” Summer 2011

(<http://www.uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/HSR-PPP-USPIRG-July-19-2011.pdf>)

But the American people aren't the only ones enthusiastic about high-speed rail. Businesses from around the globe are eager to compete for the billions of dollars in infrastructure spending that will accompany the nation's investment in high-speed rail. In 2009, 30 companies from around the world committed to establish a presence or expand their existing presence in the United States if they are chosen to supply components for high-speed rail.<sup>2</sup> Prior to its cancellation, the Florida high-speed rail line attracted interest from seven teams including dozens of firms from around the globe.<sup>3</sup> In California, a request for expressions of interest from private firms drew more than 1,000 responses, while 22 funds have expressed interest in financing part of the system's construction.<sup>4</sup> The construction of high-speed rail in the United States will inevitably involve both the public and the private sector. Effective “partnerships” between the public and private sectors are critical if the nation is to get the high-speed rail network it deserves at a price it can afford.

**Solvency—HSR Key To Economy****HSR is Crucial To Mobility, Development and Overall Economic Growth**

[Steve Van Beek](#), Chief of Policy and Strategy and Director, LeighFisher, “A New Day in Rail and Intercity Travel,” National Journal Blogs, January 20th, 2012 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php?comments=expandall#comments>)

Anyone working in congested metropolitan regions on long-term planning understands that improving passenger rail services is critical to our future mobility and economic growth. In the coming decades we will have a shortage of intercity and national capacity to move people and goods. Rail, properly networked with the other modes, offers a practical and cost beneficial solution in many corridors.

Unfortunately, the nation today continues to pay for years of neglect of Amtrak and passenger rail more generally.

Thankfully the past Congress (through finally reauthorizing Amtrak and rail programs) and the current Administration have put rail back on the policy table. This has been a catalyst for many states, freight rail companies, Amtrak and others to work together on practical solutions, the benefits of which will be delivered for years to come.

Most of the critics (including many on the Hill), citing the supposed inefficiencies of HSR, rail or individual projects, are hard to take seriously as they have criticized Amtrak and other programs for years while sitting on their hands while money was shoveled out for many projects they favored that were not cost-beneficial and didn't address our core transportation issues. Instead of their voices, we should listen to groups such as the BPC, Eno, AASHTO, APTA and the Chamber that are focusing our attention to transport policies that meet the needs of passengers and shippers while addressing energy and environmental concerns. Our collective chore is to get policymakers to put partisan rancor aside and get on with the task of incrementally building a 21st Century transportation policy.



**Solvency—HSR Key to Economy (Productivity)****Long Term Transportation Objectives are Crucial for Economic Development—It's the Only Way to Maximize Productivity Gains**

Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Martin Wachs, President of the American Action Forum and a Commissioner on the Congressionally-chartered Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission and senior principal researcher at the RAND Corporation, "Strengthening Connections Between Transportation Investments and Economic Growth," National Transportation Policy Project, January 11th, 2011

(<http://www.bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/NTPP%20Strengthening%20Connections%20Paper.pdf>)

Over the long-term, higher productivity—the ability to generate more output and income from each dollar of capital or hour of work—is the key to higher labor earnings and improved standards of living. Because higher productivity is so central to economic growth, it must be an explicit concern, rather than a presumed outcome based on increased spending, when Congress finally takes up a comprehensive authorization bill. At the same time, of course, Congress will need to address other long-term transportation-related objectives including safety, energy independence, and environmental sustainability. High-productivity transportation investments can generate improvements in economic well-being by increasing connectivity and reducing congestion. This represents a critical dimension of improving long-term employment, allowing labor to enhance its productivity at lower cost and encouraging private capital investments in structures, equipment, and technologies to reap higher returns from American industry. Of course, these investments also create direct employment opportunities—primarily in the construction industry—but this short-term job creation, while vitally important, must be viewed within the context provided by a longer-term view.

**Solvency—Federal Spending Key to Jobs/Economy****Federal Spending is Crucial to Create Jobs and End the Depression**

ABC News, "Is America's Economic Recovery Built To Last?" April 29th, 2012

(<http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/04/is-americas-economic-recovery-built-to-last/>)

"The question is, in this economic time, when we have a slow recovery, what are the policies that we can adopt that would grow jobs in the United States?" asked former Michigan governor Jennifer Granholm, now host of Current TV's "The War Room."

"Can we tie tax policy to growth in the United States? Can we look at what other countries are doing to be more active about planning and about inviting investment clusters?" Granholm added. "We just don't do any of that because it's wrong to intervene in the economy."

Granholm and Krugman both advocated for additional federal stimulus spending to boost job growth and pull the country out of its ongoing unemployment struggle.

"The most important thing right now is to end the depression we're in," said Krugman, who advocated for the re-hiring of laid off public sector workers such as teachers.

"By not having enough jobs in the economy right now, by not doing stimulus, by not ending this depression, we are condemning a lot of recent college graduates to not getting a job that makes use of their skills," Krugman added. "This is destroying people's lives. It's destroying human capital. We're paying a huge price."

**Solvency—Jobs Key to Economic Recovery****American Manufacturing and High Wage Jobs are Crucial to Economic Recovery**

Stacey Lawson, U.S. Congressional Candidate and Co-founder, Center for Entrepreneurship & Technology, UC Berkeley, "Making More in America: Creating Jobs and Rebuilding Our Middle Class," Huffington Post, April 27th, 2012 ([http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stacey-lawson/making-more-in-america-cr\\_b\\_1451110.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stacey-lawson/making-more-in-america-cr_b_1451110.html))

We need to make the American dream a reality again by restoring the high-wage jobs that are the foundation of a sustainable economic recovery. Jobs that allow parents to send their kids to college and provide a secure retirement. Jobs that will come from a revitalized American manufacturing economy.

Since 2000, America has lost [nearly one-third of its manufacturing jobs](#) -- a loss directly related to our shrinking middle class. But this is only part of a larger trend. In 1970, manufacturing jobs represented 27 percent of America's workforce. Today they represent only 10 percent.

Manufacturing is one of the few sources of steady and secure jobs for those who do not graduate from four-year colleges. A fair and just economy means creating opportunity for everyone, not only those with college degrees or, increasingly, advanced degrees. Spurring manufacturing is one of the ways we can reverse the rapidly growing equality gap in our country that has seen the rich get dramatically richer and virtually everyone else fall behind.

The average wage for [manufacturing work is 20 percent higher](#) than the national average, and beyond this, each manufacturing job creates up to four downstream jobs. And for every dollar spent in the manufacturing [sector creates \\$1.43 in other sectors](#). These are the kind of high-wage jobs that are the foundation of a sustainable economic recovery and will revive Main Streets up and down my beautiful district and throughout America.

**AT: Long Time to Develop/No Right of Way Access****Even if Some Projects are Longer Term, Existing Right of Ways Allow Projects to Begin Operation and Development Now**

Emil Frankel, Visiting Scholar, Bipartisan Policy Center, "Celebrate the Possible," National Journal Blogs, January 17th, 2012 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php?comments=expandall#comments>)

Investment in the most beneficial intercity passenger rail projects can bring both short-term and long-term economic returns -- construction and construction-related jobs right away and improved access to permanent jobs and greater labor market mobility in the long-term. These returns were described in some detail in a report by Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Martin Wachs, "Strengthening Connections Between Transportation Investments and Economic Growth," released by the Bipartisan Policy Center's National Transportation Policy Project in January 2011.

Certainly, the "right" intercity passenger rail projects would fall into the category of transportation investments that could bring short- and long-term returns. However, the Obama Administration continues to struggle with the effects of having originally oversold the President's "high-speed rail" initiative. The initial marketing of this program suggested that America should strive for a national system of bullet trains, like those of Japan, France, Spain, and China. It remains highly unlikely, however, that such a national system is achievable in any reasonable period of time, if ever. The environmental, social, and financial costs of constructing such services on new rights-of-way (ROWs) in the most densely populated and urbanized regions of the country, that is, in those areas in which there are markets for such services, would seem much too high, and the possibility of insurmountable community and local opposition appears much too likely.

However, incremental, and substantial, improvements to existing ROWs in urbanized regions -- improvements that promise faster, more frequent, and more reliable intercity passenger rail services -- can be undertaken and promise great benefits. Such investments could be undertaken rather quickly, producing construction jobs very soon. Indeed, plans for many of these projects have been discussed for many years and have waited only for adequate investment capital and for the adoption of new forms of governance and management to be initiated. Moreover, the "right" investments would occur where there are markets, thus minimizing the need for continuing large operating subsidies.

**AT: Econ Advantage CPs****Transportation Infrastructure Creates Long Term Jobs and Economic Benefits—Other Short Term Job Gains Aren't Sufficient**

Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Martin Wachs, President of the American Action Forum and a Commissioner on the Congressionally-chartered Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission and senior principal researcher at the RAND Corporation, "Strengthening Connections Between Transportation Investments and Economic Growth," National Transportation Policy Project, January 11th, 2011

(<http://www.bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/NTPP%20Strengthening%20Connections%20Paper.pdf>)

In actuality employment impacts have been far more variable from one project to another, even when one considers only directly-related construction jobs. And while there is great interest in short-term job creation during a deep recession, it is also important to focus on longer-term impacts. Transportation investments can have a more significant and lasting impact on jobs by providing a foundation for overall economic growth and improved productivity well into the future. By contrast, hastily spending tens of billions of dollars on "shovel-ready" projects for the primary purpose of immediate job creation risks misallocating resources in ways that fail to maximize overall returns to the economy. Federal legislation should focus future spending on surface transportation in ways that reach well beyond the immediate creation of construction jobs to capture broad, sustainable economic benefits.

**AT: No Place for HSR in the US****Mega-regions are Ideal for HSR Now—They Have Necessary Populations and Distances**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

Megaregions are large networks of metropolitan areas linked by overlapping commuting patterns and business travel, economic activity, urbanization, and cultural resources. They stretch over hundreds of miles with populations of greater than 10 million people (America 2050 2008). They provide an ideal setting for high-speed rail networks because they concentrate multiple metropolitan areas and their central business districts within corridors or networks of 100 to 600 miles (America 2050 2011). As figure 4 illustrates, this is the distance at which high-speed rail trips are more time and cost-effective than trips by automobile or airplane (Steer Davies Gleave 2004). Sir Peter Hall (2011, 352) has recently commented favorably on the potential for high-speed rail in the California and Northeast Megaregions, although he is less sanguine about the megaregions further from the coasts. [T]he spatial scale of these regions is ideally suited to HSR as a competitor to air, with the major cities spaced along linear corridors over distances up to 500 miles, served by some of the world's most trafficked (and hence most profitable) short haul air corridors. Elsewhere—first in Japan and now in Europe—HSR has quickly seized the lion's share of traffic along analogous corridors: Tokyo-Nagoya-Osaka, Paris-Lyon-Marseille, London-Manchester, Paris-Brussels-Amsterdam and Madrid-Zaragoza-Barcelona. There is no reason to believe that the result will be different on corridors such as Washington-New York-Boston or San Francisco-Los Angeles. (Hall 2011, 352) Many U.S. megaregions, including those in California, the Northeast, the Midwest, Cascadia, and Texas, contain corridors of comparable length and connect metropolitan regions comparable in size to successful high-speed rail corridors around the world (figure 5). The distances between urban centers in these corridors are also long enough for trains to reach high speeds, making them time-competitive with other modes. For example, to reach 200 mph, high-speed trains require about 16 miles of straight and flat track to accelerate (Amtrak 2010a). Highspeed trains also need significant distances to brake and come to a stop, so stations must be well-spaced along high-speed rail corridors to maximize reductions in travel time.

**AT: Nuclear Power Bad****HSR Doesn't Have to Rely on Nuclear Power in the US**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

Nuclear power is a significant source of electricity for passenger rail in countries such as Belgium, France, Germany, and Spain. France is by far the largest nuclear power user, with a share of more than 85 percent for railway operations. However, growing concerns about nuclear power following the 2011 Fukushima Daiichi plant accident in Japan raise doubts about its role in the development of a U.S. high-speed rail system in the near future. Spain's rail network uses renewable energy sources for 18.4 percent of its electricity (IFEU 2008). Japan's high-speed rail uses geothermal and hydro power to meet up to 56 percent of its energy needs (Tan 2011).

## AT: HSR Racist

**HSR Will Benefit Minority Communities and Reshape Racial Demographics**

The Root, "High-Speed Rail Races to the USA?" August 15th, 2011 (<http://www.theroot.com/views/america-s-high-speed-rail-strategy?page=0,2>)

More than a decade ago, Amtrak introduced high-speed trains to the U.S. under its [Acela Northeast corridor service](#). But the electric trains, which can reach a top speed of 150 mph, only average 70 mph on the route between New York and Washington [because of track limitations and congestion](#). Amtrak is seeking approval for funding from Congress to make badly needed track improvements, upgrades and expansions to its Acela trains, reports the [Business Alliance for Northeast Mobility](#).

Nonetheless, Hart says bullet trains would especially benefit minorities, who are [less likely to own cars](#), and become more mobile with increased access to transportation and by virtue of the trains' speed. They could revolutionize commutes and potentially change African-American demographics.

"For example, it will cut travel time from New York City to Albany, N.Y., to 45 minutes versus 2 1/2 hours," Smith said. "What it could also do is cause minority communities to spread from cities to rural and suburban areas, which may be why some other congressional leaders are resisting high-speed rail. But the key thing here is that it will reduce dependency on foreign oil."



**AT: Spending Kills the Economy****Transportation Spending is Inevitable—High Speed Rail Saves Money Overall**

John Rosenthal, contributing editor for National Geographic Traveler, "Riding High-Speed Rail to a U.S. Recovery," Bloomberg News, December 18th, 2011 (<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-12-19/riding-high-speed-rail-to-a-u-s-recovery-john-rosenthal.html>)

It is undoubtedly expensive. And rejecting the massive investments required as wasteful spending would be easy if America's transportation needs were stagnant. But they aren't. The Census Bureau estimates that the population will grow by 100 million over the next 40 years. And most of those people will reside in urban areas where airports and highways are already bursting at the seams.

Compared with the cost of building new airports, widening interstates, relocating highway sound barriers, and erecting millions of parking lots, high-speed rail is a bargain.

[California](#) recently revised the projections for its high-speed rail plan to \$98 billion, more than twice the previous estimate.

But even at those prices, it's cheaper than the alternative. According to Rod Diridon, executive director of the Mineta Transportation Institute, in [San Jose](#), to meet the transportation needs of California's growing population without rail, the state would have to spend more than \$100 billion to build new airports and add six lanes to every highway.

And by 2050, those highways and airports would be just as congested as they are today. But if California spends the money on high-speed rail, it can simply increase the frequency of service or add more cars per train whenever population catches up to capacity.

**AT: Other Factors More Important Than Jobs****The Failure of Employment Data is Crucial to Economic Success—Other Positive Trends are Overwhelmed By Lack of Jobs**

Fox Business, “Jobs Turn Ugly. Will Fed Swoop In?” April 23rd, 2012 (<http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2012/04/23/jobs-turn-ugly-will-fed-swoop-in/>)

Some recent economic data support the view that the recovery remains tentative and that very accommodative policies are still necessary. The March employment numbers came in well under expectations, and the number of initial jobless claims for unemployment benefits has unexpectedly climbed in recent weeks since hitting a low point in February. As reported on April 19, initial jobless claims rose to 386,000 for the week ending April 14. The previous week came in at 370,000, later revised up to 388,000.

With the intense focus on employment, not to mention housing, articulating the degree to which the economy has improved could be a slippery matter for the Fed.

There are bright spots. For instance, retail spending was up in March, and the Beige Book, released last week, reported modest to moderate economic expansion in all 12 Federal Reserve districts.

Still, the huge uncertainty hovering over the category of employment casts a pall on the more positive data, and there is concern that growth will not be robust enough to sustain the downward overall trend in unemployment.

**AT: Economy Resilient****Economic Resiliency is a Lie—The World is Unsustainable and Economic Tensions are High, Need Action to Maintain It**

Rick Newman, Chief Business Correspondent, "Why Things May Never Return To Normal," April 2010 (<http://www.usnews.com/blogs/flowchart/2009/04/10/why-things-may-never-return-to-normal.html>)

This will all blow over, right? The financial crisis will end, the economy will recover, prosperity will return, and America will reclaim its place as the world's model nation. Right? Maybe not. In his new book, *The Age of the Unthinkable*, Joshua Cooper Ramo argues that many of the systems and institutions we've relied on for decades have failed, leaving us without the tools we need to navigate a complex and dangerous world. Ramo, a managing director at the consulting firm Kissinger Associates and former foreign editor at *Time*, draws on learnings from Silicon Valley venture capitalists, Middle Eastern terrorists and Japanese video-game designers to write about a new epoch in which change will be constant and unpredictable. I spoke to him recently and asked what this means for ordinary Americans. Excerpts: In your book, you describe some changes that have happened over recent years without a lot of notice. But they add up to something you describe as revolutionary. So what's changed? We live in ways that are unsustainable. The policies we rely on to make us safe are not only failing, but backfiring. The financial crisis is a perfect example of that. The world has become too complicated to make sense to most people, or to people relying on ideas that are several hundred years old. Just a year or two ago, we felt like the most powerful nation on earth. There's a sense now that the foundations of American power are not as strong as they were. This is the story of how that happened. [See why smart investors see plenty of pain ahead.] Can you offer a few more examples? There's a gap between rich and poor that we've never seen in human history. If you look at the financial mess – we don't know whom to trust to lead us out of this process. Think of the things we consider to be modern: Bioengineering, for example. Airlines. These things deliver incredible promise, but they also deliver unbelievable risk. The more interconnected you are, the more likely it is that somebody can drop a shock that permeates to all corners. One obvious marker is 9-11, when 19 guys on four airplanes realigned our entire security structure. Globalization is exacerbating all the problems in the world. We like to think that capitalism is an engine for equality, but that's not really the case anymore. The very things we rely on for progress are now the things that cause us risk. That's forcing us to recalibrate. [See how bailouts can butcher capitalism.] So how do we need to recalibrate? We need a complete revolution in how we act and how we should think. One shift we need to make is how we look at the world. We focus on single objects without paying attention to other realities of the situation. We need to go from narrow-gazing to a broad focus. Shift 2 involves the old idea of deterrence. We need to get away from deterrence, and away from these huge defense budgets, and more toward the idea of resilience. It's inevitable that bad things will happen to us. We need a Dept. of National Resilience. We need to move away from a world in which we try to terrify people, toward a world of more resilience. .

## AT: US Not Key to The World Economy

### Empirically the US Economy is Crucial to Global Economic Stability

David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., "Focus still on America to lead global recovery", The Strait Times, April 7, 2009 (lexis)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

**AT: Economy Hurts the Environment****Stable Economic Growth Creates New Technology, Ultimately Eliminates the Dangers of Environmental Collapse**

Michael Zey, Montclair University, SEIZING THE FUTURE, 1998, p. 36-37.

Once we discover new capacities, both technological and human, we are set off in novel directions, crossing boundaries and exploring frontiers we never thought existed. The Spanish explored the New World in order to extract natural resources such as gold from the Earth and spread Christianity. Many English settlements were established by people simply trying to escape religious intolerance. None could have guessed that their expression of progress circa 1600 would lead to the birth of an independent nation that became the crucible for personal liberation and technological innovation. The fact that progress itself leads to new definitions of human growth also explains the West's faith in progress. Our accomplishments consistently exceed our wildest dreams. Regardless of the stated purpose of a technology, the applications usually exceed such purposes. The automobile became important as a means of redistributing the population from cities to the suburbs; the discovery of the steam engine revolutionized industry and the very concept of abundance. Third, growth itself contains to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure the solutions to the problems it produces. Supporting this principle is the World Bank's 1992 report "Development and the Environment," which blatantly states that growth is a powerful antidote to a number of ills plaguing Third World countries, including the pollution that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, the resulting prosperity also facilitates the developments of technologies that lead to cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about \$4000 in 1993 dollars, it produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it can afford technology like catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as eastern Europe can be traced to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure environmental safety "we need a sound economy on a global basis." so the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth.

**AT: Economy Causes Poverty****Economic Growth Doesn't Contribute To, But Is the Basis for the Alleviation of, Poverty**

Gregg Easterbrook, Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution, "The Capitalist Manifesto," Review of The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth by Benjamin M. Friedman, THE NEW YORK TIMES, November 27, 2005, p. 16.

Though "The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth" may not quite succeed in showing an iron law of growth and liberalization, Friedman is surely correct when he contends that economic expansion must remain the world's goal, at least for the next few generations. Growth, he notes, has already placed mankind on a course toward the elimination of destitution. Despite the popular misconception of worsening developing-world misery, the fraction of people in poverty is in steady decline. Thirty years ago 20 percent of the planet lived on \$1 or less a day; today, even adjusting for inflation, only 5 percent does, despite a much larger global population. Probably one reason democracy is taking hold is that living standards are rising, putting men and women in a position to demand liberty. And with democracy spreading and rising wages giving ever more people a stake in the global economic system, it could be expected that war would decline. It has. Even taking Iraq into account, a study by the Center for International Development and Conflict Management, at the University of Maryland, found that the extent and intensity of combat in the world is only about half what it was 15 years ago.

**AT: States****Federal Research and Responsibility are Crucial to Successful HSR Adoption**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

Decisions about where to invest in Core Express corridors versus Regional and Emerging/Feeder services will require a more robust planning and decision-making framework at the federal level than has been possible to date. Recent research by America 2050 (2011) provides a potential starting point for understanding which rail corridors may justify different levels of investment and service. That study rated potential existing rail corridors nationwide on a scale of 0 to 21 based on factors contributing to rail ridership demand, such as population density, employment concentrations, transit connections, existing air markets, and congestion on parallel road corridors (figure 6). A similar approach should be adopted by federal decision makers to prioritize investments in high-speed rail corridors, combined with a study of construction and operating costs for each corridor.

**AT: States****Federal Programs are Critical to Ensure that HSR Projects are Directed and Efficient**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

Even though PRIIA is authorized through 2013, stakeholders in the rail industry, including one of the drafters of PRIIA, have remarked on the need to adjust federal rail policy to respond to current circumstances, including greater political instability in the Middle East and its implications for America's dependence on foreign oil; growing international and private sector interest in helping to finance high-speed rail in the United States; and the president's own ambitious proposals for a national high-speed rail network to give 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail over the next 25 years (Gardner 2011). Such a vision requires a stronger and more active federal commitment that must start with secure funding. The most recent setback of zero funding for high-speed rail in the FY 2011 budget underscores the need for a sustainable revenue source as reliable as funding for highway and transit programs in the past. President Obama's proposal to include a \$53 billion, six-year high-speed rail program as part of the surface transportation bill would help to achieve this kind of equity among transportation modes. In conjunction with a funding strategy, the role of high-speed rail in America's larger transportation network needs to be better defined (U.S. GAO 2009). A sharper, more narrowly focused program directed at corridors that meet clearly articulated objectives for high-speed rail service would address criticisms that the program is diffuse, ineffective, and dependent on ongoing subsidies. Nationally available data could help to evaluate the most promising regions for attracting ridership and enhancing economic and other benefits. A phasing plan and funding allocation strategy could help develop the full build-out of a national network by helping states secure rights-of-way for high-speed rail corridors. Another challenge is to clarify the differences between conventional and high-speed rail corridors. PRIIA provides federal grants for both conventional passenger rail and new high-speed corridors, although the media has tended to focus on the high-speed program. Neither PRIIA nor ARRA specified the share of federal funding to be used for high-speed Core Express corridors versus conventional passenger rail. In fact, the dearth of highspeed rail projects in the planning pipeline means that grants will be shared among various types of rail projects. A more active role by the federal government could help clarify the respective roles of high-speed Core Express corridors and conventional Regional and Emerging/Feeder routes, including funding them through separate programs and clearly defining the objectives for each type of rail service. Funding for maintaining and upgrading existing rail corridors could be provided through formula funds based on passenger train movements, track miles, or ridership. President Obama's FY 2012 budget proposal for the Department of Transportation moved in this direction by establishing different competitive grant programs, including network development for constructing new corridors and system preservation for maintaining safety and reliability on existing corridors (White House 2011).



## AT: States

**Multistate Rail Lines Prove Federal Leadership is Crucial to HSR**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

The national high-speed rail program also must overcome a lack of effective institutions and administrative structures for building and operating multistate corridors. Public benefit corporations capable of entering into public-private partnerships could develop and maintain high-speed rail infrastructure across megaregional, multistate, and even binational territories. These corporations would be responsible for the tracks, while separate public and private entities would operate the trains. Federal legislation could be developed to enable the creation of these public infrastructure corporations. International examples of publicly chartered infrastructure corporations include the High Speed 1 (HS1) and High Speed 2 (HS2) companies in the United Kingdom, Spain's state-owned Administrator of Railway Infrastructures (Adif), and Réseau Ferré de France (RFF), the French Rail Network. Regional public benefit corporations could be created in the United States to develop and manage track infrastructure, receive federal high-speed rail grants, and enter into contracts with private consortia for design, construction, and maintenance.

**Politix—Controversial****Empirically, Standing Up for High Speed Rail is a Politically Dangerous Decision for Obama**

Slate.com, "Requiem for a Train, Dec. 7, 2011

([http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\\_speed\\_rail\\_is\\_dead\\_in\\_america\\_should\\_we\\_mourn\\_it.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high_speed_rail_is_dead_in_america_should_we_mourn_it.html))

Ultimately, high-speed rail's backers weren't as staunch as its detractors. Barack Obama and congressional Democrats put their political lives on the line for health care, addressing an immediate problem whose consequences were personal and visceral. The nation's outdated infrastructure is a major dilemma but one that doesn't feel as pressing to most voters and legislators. It's our children's problem now.

**Politix—Republicans Hate It****Republicans Hate HSR—They Don't Believe It Should be a Federal Priority**

Slate.com, "Requiem for a Train, Dec. 7, 2011

([http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\\_speed\\_rail\\_is\\_dead\\_in\\_america\\_should\\_we\\_mourn\\_it\\_.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high_speed_rail_is_dead_in_america_should_we_mourn_it_.html))

The modern federal government isn't good at solving long-term problems (if it ever was). Most Republicans don't believe the government should solve problems. They believe big government, in fact, is the one of the only problems that can't be solved by the free market. Democrats, as seen in the failures of all of these railroad projects, err by assuming that the government can solve problems more effectively than it realistically can.

**Politix—Republicans Hate It****Republicans Think Train Funding is an Attempt to Eliminate Individualism**

Slate.com, "Off the Rails," March 8th, 2011

([http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/politics/2011/03/off\\_the\\_rails.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2011/03/off_the_rails.html))

That's in the fantasy world. In the real world, libertarians aren't cheering for high speed rail but rather trying to stop it from being built. They are succeeding. In Ohio, Gov. John Kasich campaigned against a high-speed rail line funded by the stimulus, got elected, and turned down the funding. In Wisconsin, Gov. Scott Walker did the same thing, only more so—his anti-train campaign even had [its own Web site](#). In Florida, the state Supreme Court has [just approved](#) Gov. Rick Scott's decision to reject \$2.4 billion of federal funds to build a Tampa-Orlando rail line; the state was being asked to contribute only \$280 million to finish it off. The funding was originally agreed to by Charlie Crist, one of the Tea Party's archenemies, so Scott's victory could hardly be any sweeter.

But it could hardly make less sense to liberals. What, exactly, do Republicans, conservatives, and libertarians have against trains? Seriously, what? Why did President George W. Bush try to zero out Amtrak funding in 2005? Why is the conservative Republican Study Committee suggesting that we do so now? Why does [George Will think](#) "the real reason for progressives' passion for trains is their goal of diminishing Americans' individualism in order to make them more amenable to collectivism"?

**Neg—HSR Incompatible With Status Quo Infrastructure****Real HSR is Incompatible With Status Quo Infrastructure—Can't Take Place Now**

Garl Latham, owner of Latham Railway Services, a Dallas-based planning and consulting firm, "So, now we're partners?," Progressive Railroading, September 20th, 2011

(<http://myprogressiverailroading.com/blogs/gblatham/archive/2011/09/20/so-now-we-re-partners.aspx>)

Regarding the feds' fatuousness, LaHood indicated that the current administration "strongly supports" both "high speed rail and freight rail." For whatever reason(s), the DOT remains unclear on the most basic concept of all: true H.S.R. is literally incompatible with existing Class I railway infrastructure and operations!

Now, if they'd like to seriously discuss conventional passenger service, that's another matter. Let interested governmental bodies come to the table with a pile of cash - and the understanding that public benefits must be funded with public monies, that current and future capacity is a vital matter, that liability protection is non-negotiable, and that ALL costs for improvements which the railroad's don't require for their own operations but are only necessary for the passenger side of the equation, including ongoing maintenance and taxes, must be borne by other entities - then I'm sure the "partners" will be ready to negotiate. Please note, however, my use of the modifier "conventional." No matter how much certain parties might wish this wasn't true, we'd still not be discussing true H.S.R.!

**Neg—HSR Not Economically Viable****Empirically, HSR is Not Economically Sustainable**

Thomas Sowell, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, “High-speed rail will get us nowhere very fast,” Union Leader, February 1st, 2012

(<http://www.unionleader.com/article/20120201/OPINION02/702019945&source=RSS>)

The high-speed rail system proposed for California has been envisioned as a model for similar systems elsewhere in the United States. A recent story in the San Francisco Chronicle used the high-speed rail system in Spain as an analogy for California.

Spain is about the same size as California, and has a similar population density — and population density is the key to the economic viability of mass transportation, from subways to high-speed rail.

It so happens that I have ridden on Spain's high-speed rail system. It was very nice, especially since I did not have to pay the full costs, which were subsidized by the Spanish taxpayers.

While the Spanish government has been subsidizing the passengers on its high-speed rail system, the European Union has been subsidizing the Spanish government. Someone once said that government is the illusion that we can all live off somebody else. Spain's high-speed rail system is not even covering its operating costs, never mind the enormous costs of setting up the system in the first place. One reason is that half the seats are empty in the high-speed trains in Spain.

That is what happens when you don't have the population density required for passengers to cover the operating costs. You would need the hordes of Genghis Khan riding the high-speed rail system to cover the additional costs of the rails and the trains.

An economics professor at the University of Barcelona says that Spain “has not recovered one single euro from the infrastructure investment.”

The most famous high-speed rail system is that in Japan, one of the most densely populated countries in the world. The “bullet train” between Tokyo and Osaka has 130 million riders a year. Tokyo alone has more than three times the population of San Francisco and Los Angeles put together.

In California, an element of farce has been added to the impending economic tragedy, if the envisioned high-speed rail system actually materializes.

**Neg—Spending Doesn't Create Jobs****Government Spending Doesn't Create Jobs—Empirically It Can Only Depress Other Factors of Job Creation**

Calafia Beach Pundit, "Illustrating the Failure of Keynesian Pump-priming," Seeking Alpha, Jun 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011  
 (<http://seekingalpha.com/article/277498-illustrating-the-failure-of-keynesian-pump-priming>)

I've showed this [before](#), but it's worthwhile repeating. The chart below makes a bold and striking statement: The more the government spends, in relation to the size of the economy, the higher the rate of unemployment; the less the government spends, the lower the rate of unemployment. That's not the same as saying that rising government spending causes the unemployment rate to rise, since it's very true that rising unemployment forces the government to spend more (e.g., for unemployment benefits and other assistance to those losing their jobs), and rising unemployment goes hand in hand with a weaker economy, and that tends to push government spending higher in relation to GDP. So I want to be careful with the causation/correlation argument here. But the experience of the past several years has been remarkable, in that there is no question that three years ago the government embarked on a major campaign to stimulate the economy via a massive increase in government spending. The big rise in spending as a percentage of GDP in the past three years was mostly driven by a forced increase in spending, and only partially by the fact that automatic stabilizers (e.g., unemployment insurance, food stamps) kick in as the economy weakens. And it is clear that this virtually unprecedented spending boost coincided with the biggest and fastest rise in the unemployment rate, and the deepest recession and slowest recovery in many decades. At the very least, this is prima facie evidence that Keynesian pump priming doesn't work, and it's potentially strong evidence that a big dose of pump priming not only doesn't work, but makes things worse. Furthermore, it's evidence that a significant reduction in government spending as a percentage of GDP does not prevent a significant strengthening of the economy: consider the 1993-2000 period in the above chart, when both spending and the unemployment rate experienced significant declines. Spending is the elephant in the living room, and it needs to be cut back sharply. Government spending doesn't add to demand -- it wastes resources. When the government spends more than it takes in, that money has to come from somewhere. And when government spends money, it does so much less efficiently than the private sector. Moreover, deficit-financed spending takes just as many resources out of the economy as tax-financed spending. The only difference between the two is that when the government borrows to finance its spending, the private sector at least has the hope of recovering the money some day, whereas with higher tax rates, there is no hope of recovery. Plus, higher tax rates impact future decisions adversely, since they reduce the after-tax rewards to saving and investing and thus reduce future living standards by depressing investment activity. The debate in Washington over spending cuts vs. higher tax rates is extremely important to the future of the economy. This has nothing to do with partisanship, and everything to do with basic common sense and the facts presented in the chart above. Since more government spending has hurt the economy, less government spending should help the economy.

**Neg—US Not Solve the Global Economy****The US Can't Solve Global Economic Problems Any Longer**

Op-Ed News, "US slowdown intensifies global economic crisis," April 29th, 2012

(<http://www.opednews.com/articles/US-slowdown-intensifies-gl-by-Patrick-Martin-120429-231.html>)

The Commerce Department report shows that the United States cannot serve as an engine of global economic recovery, as it did in decades past. American corporations are awash with cash -- an estimated \$2 trillion at least -- but they find it more profitable to buy back their own stock than to invest in production.

The agency said the slowdown in US GDP growth "primarily reflected a deceleration in private inventory investment and a downturn in nonresidential fixed investment." In other words, it was the byproduct of the refusal of major corporations to build new buildings or buy computers and equipment.

The category of "nonresidential fixed investment" actually showed a decline of 2.1 percent in the first quarter of 2012, compared to a rise of 5.2 percent in the fourth quarter of 2011. Businesses also slowed their accumulation of inventory, evidently anticipating they would have difficulty selling any excess goods.

Another major contributor to the slowdown was a 3.0 percent decline in government spending, as local, state and federal governments have all cut back. This follows a 4.2 percent drop in government spending in the fourth quarter of 2011.



**Neg—Economy Resilient****The Global Economy is Fundamentally Resilient, It Can Survive Even Substantial Disruption**

Reuters, "Global economy has stopped shrinking, says Fitch Ratings," July 2nd, 2009

([http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition\\_id=10&categ\\_id=3&article\\_id=103694](http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition_id=10&categ_id=3&article_id=103694))

LONDON/NEW YORK/SINGAPORE: Fitch Ratings says in a new report the global economy has likely stopped shrinking and will slowly begin to recover during the second half of this year. But economic recovery will be anemic and unemployment will continue to rise through most of next year and, consequently, the world's major central banks are not expected to begin raising policy interest rates until late 2010 at the earliest. The credit quality of the large "AAA" sovereigns (US, UK, France, Germany) has been eroded by the financial crisis and severity of the global recession. But although Fitch does not expect fiscal deficits to begin to narrow materially until 2011, credit quality remains within "AAA" tolerances given the exceptional balance sheet and funding flexibility conferred by "benchmark" borrower and "reserve currency" status. David Riley, global head of Fitch's Sovereign Rating group said: "A key credit support for retaining "AAA" status is confidence that, over the medium-term, government debt levels will be brought down from the elevated levels forecast. "Stable Outlooks on 'AAA' sovereign ratings reflect our expectation that governments will set out stronger medium-term fiscal consolidation plans over the next year or so necessary to place public finances on a sustainable path and underpin confidence in their creditworthiness and commitment to low inflation," Fitch said. Without cuts in public spending in tandem with tax increases, Fitch predicts that government debt would reach 100 percent of GDP in the US and UK by 2012 and 2013 respectively, while government debt ratios in France and Germany will exceed 90 percent of GDP by the middle of the next decade. Fitch added that while the capacity to fund large deficits and debt remains extremely strong and the interest burden remains modest by historical standards, public finances would be much more vulnerable to adverse shocks and less able to pursue counter-cyclical fiscal policy, a key characteristic of "AAA" sovereigns. Outside of the advanced economies, emerging market (EM) sovereigns remain buffeted by the global crisis, with the principal rating risk so far centered on sharp declines in private capital flows, including cross-border bank lending, which continue to pressure balance of payments and financial stability, especially in central and Eastern Europe. The weak global economic environment and reduced availability and higher cost of financing are also putting pressuring on non-sovereign credit quality, with approximately a third of emerging market companies and banks with international ratings from Fitch (some 700 worldwide) currently on Negative Outlook/Watch, with only 2 percent on Positive Outlook. But while several EM sovereigns have had their ratings downgraded and further downgrades are likely, Riley said that "EM sovereign credit quality has so far proved resilient in the face of the most severe global financial crisis and economic recession in decades," Fitch said. - Reuters

**Neg—States Solve****Empirically States Can Fund, Construct and Operate HSR Successfully on Their Own**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned and Robert Lane, director, associate planner for America 2050 and senior fellow for urban design at America 2050, Regional Plan Association, High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Policy Focus Report, 2011

([https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948\\_1268\\_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR\\_Webster.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf))

In the absence of consistent federal support for passenger rail, states including California, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Washington have established dedicated funding streams to improve conventional passenger rail corridors operated by Amtrak. Other states, such as Illinois, Maine, and Vermont, have directed state general funds or flexible federal funds to subsidize and supplement their passenger rail service (U.S. GAO 2010). These state investments have led to the purchase of new rail cars in Washington, track upgrades for and re-electrification of the Keystone Corridor in Pennsylvania, and more frequent, reliable service and higher ridership on all state-sponsored lines. State funding for rail has come from various sources, including portions of state gas and diesel taxes, flexible funding from the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, state rental car taxes, and proceeds from specially branded Cash Train scratch lottery tickets in Washington state.